FILED

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

AUG 06 2009

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

PEDRO GONZALEZ GONZALEZ,

No. 07-71410

Petitioner,

Agency No. A095-448-406

v.

MEMORANDUM*

ERIC H. HOLDER Jr., Attorney General,

Respondent.

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted July 29, 2009**

Before: WALLACE, LEAVY, and HAWKINS, Circuit Judges.

Pedro Gonzalez Gonzalez, a native and citizen of Mexico, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order denying his motion to

^{*} This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

reopen. Our jurisdiction is governed by 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We dismiss in part and deny in part the petition for review.

The evidence Gonzalez Gonzalez presented with his motion to reopen concerned the same basic hardship grounds previously considered by the agency. *See Fernandez v. Gonzales*, 439 F.3d 592, 602-03 (9th Cir. 2006). We therefore lack jurisdiction to review the BIA's determination that the evidence was insufficient to warrant reopening.

Gonzalez Gonzalez's contention that the BIA violated due process by misapplying the law to the facts of his case does not state a colorable due process claim. *See Martinez-Rosas v. Gonzales*, 424 F.3d 926, 930 (9th Cir. 2005) ("traditional abuse of discretion challenges recast as alleged due process violations do not constitute colorable constitutional claims that would invoke our jurisdiction").

To the extent that Gonzalez Gonzalez contends that the BIA violated due process by failing to consider all or some of his evidence, he has not overcome the presumption that the BIA did review the record. *See Fernandez*, 439 F.3d at 603.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DISMISSED in part; DENIED in part.